

Appia No. 09/575,116
Amndt. Dated September 3, 2004
Response to Office action of July 6, 2004

8

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35USC § 103

In this section, the Examiner has objected to claims 1 to 40 as being obvious in light of Wright et al and Cass. In view of the Examiner's objections and to obtain speedy allowance of the application, the claims have been amended to introduce further distinctions over the prior art. As a result we believe that all pending claims are novel and inventive.

Claim 1 has now been amended to specify that at least some of the coded data is coincident with the details on the printed document, and represents a user interactive element, such that placing the sensing device in an operative position relative to the details senses the coded data representing the user interactive element. A basis for this can be found at line 12 onwards of page 29 and Figure 1. These features are not shown by the prior art, and we respectfully submit renders the claim novel and inventive.

Wright et al describes an electronic greeting card communication system that includes browsing through available electronic greeting cards from a collection stored in the browsing memory.

Cass describes a method in which a processor is provided with two images. One of the images is a document to which the user marks, and the other is the reference document to which no mark is added. The processor determines the user's selection by performing image-processing analysis to compare the two documents to first identify the user's marks and then map the user's selection to a list of active elements (abstract).

Thus, this is in contrast to the current invention, which requires that the sensing device is placed in an operative position with respect to the details to thereby sense the corresponding coded data. The sensing device therefore only needs to scan a part of the document in order to determine the coded data, which is in contrast to the combined teachings of the prior art which require the entire document to be scanned.

Thus, we respectfully submit that even if the teachings of Wright et al and Cass were combined, the system would fail to teach amended claim 1. In particular, the combined teachings would form a process that involves marking a first document, scanning the entire first document in order to compare this to a second document, and then determining the active element using complex image processing. This does not allow a sensing device to be placed in an operative position to detect coded data corresponding to a user interactive element to thereby select a card.

Appia No. 09/575.116
Amdt. Dated September 3, 2004
Response to Office action of July 6, 2004

9

It will be appreciated that the current invention defined by claim 1 can provide a number of advantages over the prior art. For example the current invention reduces a two step process taught by the prior art, involving marking the document and then scanning the document, to a one step process involving placing the sensing device in an operative position relative to the details on the document.

Thus, the invention defined by claim 1 does not require the user to physically mark the paper, but merely select the information by placing the sensing device in an operative position relative to the details. The sensing device then detects the coded data at this location and generates the indicating data. This is in contrast to the combined teachings which requires a physical mark to be made on the document in order for the scanner to determine the selection made by the user.

Additionally, both Wright et al and Cass fail to suggest at least some of the coded data being coincident with the details on the document, as required by amended claim 1. Instead a separate bar code is used, which is separate to the printed details, thereby necessitating the scanning of the entire document. It will be appreciated by the Examiner that as the systems of the prior art use printed information, and a separate bar code at a distinct location, there is no disclosure of providing coded data coincident with details. In the current claim 1, since at least some of the coded data is coincident to the details on the document, the user may operatively use the sensing device similar to a pen such that only the details need to be selected, and not the entire document.

The current system is cost effective, as a separate scanner and marking device is not required. Additionally, the current system is time efficient since a two step process of marking and then scanning is reduced into a one step process where the marking and scanning are performed simultaneously by the user. Furthermore, the current system provides the advantage of being more accurate compared to the prior art, which requires the scanning of the entire document and performing image processing to determine the mark made on the page. It will be appreciated that image processing can be processor intensive, costly, and inaccurate in situations where the document is skewed or not scanned correctly. Also, the current invention provides ease of use to the user, as the scanning device is able to scan the coded data while simultaneously being operatively used relative to the page to select particular details

Therefore we respectfully submit that claim 1 provides numerous advantages over the combined teachings of Wright et al and Cass. Additionally, the combined teachings of Wright et al and Cass fail to suggest at least some of the coded data that may be coincident with the details on the printed document, such that placing the sensing device in an operative position relative to the details senses the corresponding coded data. Therefore we respectfully submit that claim 1 is inventive in light of the prior art.

Similar amendments have been made to independent claims 16 and 31, and therefore the above arguments also apply.

Appn No. 09/575,116
Amdt. Dated September 3, 2004
Response to Office action of July 6, 2004

10

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 1 to 40, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN



JACQUELINE ANNE LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762